

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>JAMAL F. WOODLEY SR.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	:	<b>Case No. 2:24-cv-01619</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>Judge Algenon L. Marbley</b>
	:	<b>Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman</b>
<b>DAVID C. YOUNG, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Respondents.</b>	:	

**ORDER**


This matter comes before this Court on the Magistrate Judge’s Reports and Recommendations (“R&Rs”) (ECF Nos. 13, 16) that Petitioner’s *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 1) be dismissed without prejudice, and that his motion seeking a stay (ECF No. 14) be denied.

On February 13, 2024, Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in connection with his state-court criminal proceedings. (ECF No. 1). At the time the petition was filed, Petitioner was a pretrial detainee awaiting trial in the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas. (See ECF No. 16 at 1). On August 20, 2024, Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman issued a Report and Recommendation that the habeas petition be dismissed without prejudice to refile after petitioner has exhausted all available state-court remedies. (ECF No. 13). On September 4, 2024, Petitioner filed a motion seeking a stay so that he may pursue relief in the state courts. (ECF No. 14). On November 13, 2024, Magistrate Judge Bowman issued a Report and Recommendation that the motion for a stay be denied. (ECF No. 16). The R&R noted that review of the Franklin County online docket records reveals that, since filing the petition in this case, Petitioner has entered several no contest pleas in his pending cases as part of a plea bargain. (*Id.*

at 1). Additionally, judgment entries imposing petitioner's sentence were issued on October 16, 2024 and October 22, 2024, and Petitioner was appointed counsel for appeal. (*Id.*). Both R&Rs advised that any objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days and cautioned that failure to object will result in a waiver of the right to have the District Judge review the R&R. (ECF No. 13 at 5–6; ECF No. 16 at 5–6). No objections to the R&Rs have been filed, and the time for making any objections has passed.

Having reviewed the R&Rs, this Court agrees with the analysis therein and **ADOPTS** the R&Rs in their entirety. (ECF Nos. 13, 16). Accordingly, Petitioner's motion seeking a stay (ECF No. 14) is **DENIED**; and his *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to refiling after petitioner has exhausted all available state court remedies. Furthermore, this Court **DECLINES** to issue a certificate of appealability because, for the reasons stated in the R&R (ECF No. 13), Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right that is remediable at this juncture in this proceeding. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). This Court **CERTIFIES** to the Sixth Circuit, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal would not be taken in "good faith" and should not be permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 24(a); *Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
**ALGENON L. MARBLEY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**DATED: May 8, 2025**